

are visible on both sides of the Atlantic, and, under the plea of "justice to Ireland" the Roman hierarchy and its ramifications are aiming at nothing short of the downfall of England, as a consequence, the overthrow of Protestantism. Unfortunately for "this Canada of ours," partyism in politics has been so excessive, has so permeated our Canadian electorate that it has become the bane of the Dominion, and the politicians owing to the exigencies of (I had almost said) cursed partyism, have become recreant to duty as citizens of a British Province, and by such action, have so encouraged the enemy in making attacks upon our liberties, that they have of late almost dictated to our rulers their course of action.

This "Irish nuisance" has brought us almost to the verge of servitude to those whom we cannot call by any better name than enemies to our common country.

As you truly indicate, these are not the times, nor are these R. C. dictators, the characters which justify mealy-mouthed speeches, or cowardly compliance with their disloyal requirements. I think, too, if some of our secular daily papers would throw off the incubus of priestly domination, and fear of losing votes, to such an extent as lending their influence in checking these aggressions of the "black brigade," they would only be doing their duty as professed advocates of loyal principles and sentiments.

We have always desired to give our R. C. fellow-subjects equal rights with ourselves, but that does not satisfy them. I have always believed that the chief cause of "Irish trouble" is founded on Popery, and, the older I grow, with the recent developments I witness, confirm me in this opinion, the fact is, and the sooner we realize it, however plain, unvarnished, and unpleasant it may be, and act upon such conclusions, the better for all parties concerned, nothing short of supreme control will satisfy Rome, and that she must not have. We cannot afford to sacrifice our civil and religious liberty, and if we are true men we shall not; but let us see to it, that we each use our influence on the side of love and loyalty to our Queen and to our country as an integral portion of the British Empire.

Toronto, May 6th, 1887

WHO ARE THE ENGLISH?

SIR,—In face of the nonsense one sees every now and then from those smitten with a false Anglo-mania, the following taken from Dr. Porter's "who are the Irish" in the *Day of Days* for April, may prove of interest to some of your readers in Canada. He says:

"Is there then such a difference of nationality, race and origin, between the inhabitants of England and the inhabitants of Ireland, as to justify the 'ironical laughter' (alluding to a circumstance in the House of Commons) 'in the one case and the hasty correction in the other.' Is there a greater difference between the peoples of England and Ireland, than between, say, the peoples of Middlesex and Cornwall? If the terms 'Anglo-Saxon race' may be applied loosely to the Cornish men, is it wholly and laughably inaccurate, when applied to the population of the sister isle?"

Let us ask first who are the English? The celebrated historian, Mr. Green, tells us that English blood is indeed a varied mixture. The people of England sprang from the intermingling of the Celt, the Saxon, the Dane and the Norman. So true is it that Celtic blood is present in English veins, that the brilliant author of "The making of England," does not hesitate to aver that there is not a single English man who dare affirm that Celtic ancestry is not represented in his own personality. The author of "The conquest of England" describes the mixture of race that gave birth to the present population of England, in this wise—"Celt and Gael, Welshman and Irishman, Frisian and Flamand, French Huguenot and German Palatine, have come successively in, and a hundred smaller streams of foreign blood. The intermingling of race has nowhere been less hindered by national antipathy; and even the hindrances interposed by law, such as Offa's prohibition of marriage between English and Welsh, or Edward III's prohibition of marriage between English and Irish—have met with the same disregard. The result is, as far as blood goes, few nations are of an origin more mixed than the present English nation: for there is no living Englishman who can say with certainty, that the blood of any one of the races we have named, does not mingle in his veins." If this be true, what becomes of the "ironical laughter" of our learned legislation? Some slight acquaintance with English History might well be considered a preliminary qualification for an aspirant to a seat in the Parliament of England. It is edifying to find our legislative assembly, amused at the supposed egregious blunder of applying the phrase, "Anglo Saxon race" to the Irish people, when not a single member can be sure he is not more or less Irish in his own origin. But Mr. Green is more daring. He actually attributes Shakespeare's genius in some degree to the Celtic ele-

ment in the great poet's nature. Here are the historian's words: "It is not without significance that the highest type of the race, the one Englishman, who has combined in their largest measure the mobility and the fancy of the Celt, with the depth and energy of the Teutonic temper, has been on the old Welsh and English borderland, in the forest of Arden." The present Prime Minister claims Welsh kinship; the last may derive something of his great oratorical gifts from the Saelic element, that mingles in his scottish blood." I do wish every clergyman and member of Parliament in Canada, would spare one penny and get this copy of "Day of Days," we should not then have the many "laughable" mistakes one sees made almost every day. Until "Ethnology" is studied a little more by Englishmen, we shall have a crude "politics," "Ethics" and "Theology."

I am, sir, yours, X.

GRATITUDE AND PROVIDENCE.

SIR,—Very often I read such papers as the *Toronto News*, and think over the language of a great many persons I meet with while travelling in different parts of Canada. I think how appropriate are the words that Sir Walter Scott puts into the mouth of Colonel Talbot in "Waverley": "If the path of gratitude and honor were always smooth and easy, there would be little merit in following it; but it moves often in contradiction to our interest and passions, and sometimes to our better affections." When some Canadians think of England and of God may I ask them to think also of the above and of the following: "Were everything to happen in the ordinary train of events, the future would be subject to the rules of arithmetic, like the chances of gaining. But extraordinary events, and wonderful runs of luck defy the calculations of mankind, and throw impenetrable darkness on future contingencies." (Introduction to Guy Mannering). Sir Walter Scott was not a "fool" or a "fat person"; he was a Scotch "genius," and if Canada's youth would study his writings instead of throwing "Marmion," &c. overboard, they would be none the worse for it. America appreciates Scott. Why not Canada?

Yours,
NOT AN ENGLISHMAN.

DOCTRINE OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

SIR,—No man who, has travelled as much as I have travelled, and who as mixed with society as I have mixed—from the "Shanties of Canada" and the "Seven Dials" of London, to an occasional seat among the "upper ten" in two or three countries of the old world; and who has seen and known what I have seen, and do know (both at the "articled clerk's desk," and in the "parson's study," can for one moment believe that the present rage for things "novel" is not "breaking the back bone" of society. Were I to "open out," I could fill pages of your paper with horrors of all sorts. It will not do to point a finger at the aristocracy of England as certain ignorant Canadians and Americans are doing because of a certain trial or two. Here in our midst we have the canker until the nation is almost rotten. God be thanked for our "White Cross Society." God be thanked for all the aid possible to keep in our minds one iota of respect for the mothers and the sisters who are asleep in the quiet churchyard. I do not believe, sir, in "holding men or women over the mouth of hell" to bring about conversion, as was reported of a certain individual "down south," but I do believe that the man who in any shape or form—especially the "Divine," by his doctrine palliates sin, is a traitor to God, to humanity, to the earth he dwells upon. The people here are so delicate that they cannot bear to have "a spade called a spade," but we must "speak out," and we must "write out," or go back to pagan-ism. Bradlaugh and Ingersoll speak against religion, but we dare not speak against drunkenness, &c. Let us leave our "high church" and "low church" alone forever, and forever, and let us go forth as churchmen, and take the little children by the hand, and lead them away from blasphemy, filth, abomination, &c. There is no use in talking any longer. If the women of Canada and America do not arise, and take their just place in the world and fight for purity and sobriety, before they fight for politeness and position, they will within a few years be in the same position as the women of Turkey, India, &c.—women without souls—dogs. This is a far surer forecast than any of Mr. Wiggins's. I am, sir, yours,

C. A. FRENCH.

ALGOMA JUBILEE OFFERING.

SIR,—A few Sundays ago a special appeal from the Bishop's Commissary on behalf of the W. and O. Fund of this diocese was read in our churches. While this appeal is still ringing in our ears we are asked to contribute for the creation of a similar fund in the Algoma diocese as a Jubilee Thanksgiving offering. I fear the response will be faint if the Churchwomen

remember that the old adage "charity begins at home." But have the bishops of the several dioceses endorsed the scheme? If so, how is it that we have heard no pastoral from them urging it? Again, are the parishes in the several dioceses taking the idea up warmly? We have no means of knowing. Something must be done to fan up some warm and general feeling about it or it will be a dead failure, and as we are appealed to on the score of loyalty to the Queen, failure would seem to reflect upon our loyalty. It does not seem to have been launched in the right way. It ought to have been accompanied by a joint pastoral from the bishops, in my opinion, but I am only a

Ontario Diocese, April 27th, 1887. "WOMAN."

SKETCH OF LESSON.

SUNDAY AFTER ASCENSION.

MAY 22ND, 1887.

The Glimpse of God's Glory.

Passage to be read.—Exodus xxxiii. 18-20
xxxiv. 5-7; 28-30.

Last Sunday we read of Moses interceding with God for Israel, who had broken God's law and their own solemn promise. We saw Moses as the type of Him Who "ever liveth to make intercession for us."

To-day we find Moses asking something for himself. What he had already seen of God's Glory made him long to see more. "Show me Thy glory," says Moses. "I will show thee My goodness," is the reply. To a certain extent his prayer is granted. Let us look at what he saw, and try to understand it.

1. *The Glory of God revealed.*—It is early morning. Moses leaves the camp, all alone, and wends his way up Mount Sinai. Perfect silence reigns (xxxiv. 8-4). Nothing to be seen but rocks and chasms; sharp peaks standing out clear against the sky as he looks up. We may be sure that very solemn thoughts filled his mind as he approached the summit. He comes to a little hollow place in the rock. God bids him enter, and "now darkness envelops him (xxxiii. 22). The Lord is passing by, and His Hand shields him from the glory which mortal man cannot behold, (1 Tim. vi. 16; 1 St. John iv. 12). At length the hand is removed. God has passed by, but part of His glory remains. More than sufficient to fill the soul of Moses with such awe that he makes no attempt to describe what he saw with his bodily eyes: but to the eye of his soul such a vision is vouchsafed (vv. 6-7) as has never hitherto been revealed to him. He now sees in clearer light than ever the boundless stores of Divine Mercy; and, filled with wonder, joy, and reverence, (vv. 8-9) he intercedes for Israel, and pleads that God Himself—not His Angel, (xxxii. 34) but His Presence, (xxxiii. 14) should go among them.

2. *The Glory of God reflected.*—Moses remained in the Mount with God forty days and nights. The people were to be tested to see whether they would wait for him all this time. What has he to bring with him? Moses must provide material for the renewal of the Covenant, to replace the former tables prepared by God Himself which had been broken to pieces. Aaron and the elders of Israel are ready to meet him now. What makes them afraid to look upon him? Whence did he get that brightness? Moses' face reflected God's glory. Even the reflection was too much for Aaron and the people, so Moses veils his face while speaking to them, and goes back into God's presence with unveiled face. Can anyone have such a sight of God now? St. Paul explains very clearly in 2 Cor. iv. 4-6, that those who open their hearts to the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ can see God's glory in the face of Jesus Christ revealed to their hearts by the Holy Spirit. Those who have this light will surely reflect it. Their lives and conversation will be an epistle "known and read of all men." (St. Matt. v. 16). Let us remember that unless we see Jesus the Saviour now, it will be an awful thing to see Jesus the Judge. (Rev. i. 7; vi. 16).

Family Reading.

"FOR THE WIFE'S SAKE."

"We find that Female intemperance is increasing in such grave proportions as to threaten rapidly to become a new reproach and danger." Such is the alarming statement put forth in the official report of the House of Lords Committee on Intemperance, which sat under the chairmanship of the Duke of Westminster.

"Where three women were in prison for intemperance a few years ago, there are now ten!" So said the Rev. J. W. Horsley in 1886, when Chaplain of Clerkenwell Prison.

"We all know that the sale of drink by grocers has greatly demoralized the wives of the working